SAMPLE DELIVERABLES | SEPTEMBER 2026

# Evidence you can follow. Decisions you can use.

These samples illustrate how Keystone organizes facility findings, capital needs, maintenance data and procurement decisions. All facilities, findings, prices and performance figures are fictional. They are not client results, contractor quotations or industry benchmarks.

## Inside this pack



## The supporting toolkit

Keystone Assess includes 193 assessment items across 15 categories, evidence and responsibility fields, asset information and a configurable 20-year capital view. Scope determines the applicable review; the samples show small extracts.

Equipment capture connects asset identity, condition, technical attributes, documents and PM tasks. Import destinations and mappings are confirmed with the client software provider.

Walkthrough tools capture observations, quantities, photographs and operating constraints. Reviewed items are consolidated into an agreed scope, and the accepted-scope summary updates from approval status.

RFI and deficiency registers retain decisions, owners, due dates, correction evidence and client verification. Working-file formats and handover requirements are defined in the engagement.

## Consistency and interpretation

This demonstration uses one condition scale: 5 = excellent and 1 = critical. Source systems with different scales require explicit mapping. Priority dates, evidence coverage, cost assumptions and duplicate exclusions must be reviewed before client issue.

## Nicholas Boudreau | President & CEO

Southwest Florida | info@keystonefacilityadvisory.com | 239-371-4949

**ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE | FICTIONAL DATA**

# Executive facility-risk summary

What needs attention first, and who owns the next action?

A short extract showing how observations, evidence and operational consequence become a prioritized action register.

| 4 | 1 | USD 85,000 |
|---|---|---|
| Illustrative findings | Immediate priority | Base planning allowances |

| Finding / evidence | Priority / next step | Owner / target |
|---|---|---|
| F-01 · Emergency-power test evidence incomplete; records review DEMO-01. | P1 · Verify status with a qualified service provider; agree interim controls. | Facilities lead · Sep 14, 2026 |
| F-02 · Recurring cooling-pump faults; service log DEMO-02. | P2 · Investigate and scope renewal within six months. | Facilities lead · Jan 2027 |
| F-03 · Localized exterior sealant deterioration; photo DEMO-03. | P4 · Plan phased renewal; monitor condition. | Property manager · 2029 |
| F-04 · Asset labels incomplete; sample record DEMO-04. | P5 · Update during routine data maintenance. | Maintenance supervisor · Next routine review |

## Basis, definitions and limits

Fictional facility: Harbor Point House. Illustrative review date: September 7, 2026. This four-item extract is not a complete assessment.

Condition scale: 5 = excellent, 1 = critical. Risk points = (6 - condition) x criticality. F-01: (6 - 2) x 5 = 20; F-02: (6 - 2) x 4 = 16; F-03: (6 - 3) x 3 = 9; F-04: (6 - 4) x 2 = 4.

Sample priority bands: P1 ≥20; P2 15-19; P3 10-14; P4 5-9; P5 <5. Dates are explicit so priority and capital timing can be reviewed together. Findings require professional judgment.

**ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE | FICTIONAL DATA**

# Five-year capital decision view

What should we fund, when, and on what assumptions?

The same findings flow into a short capital view, retaining source IDs so an issue is not counted twice.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **USD 85,000**<br>2026 base allowances | **3%**<br>Illustrative annual escalation | **USD 88,758**<br>Five-year forecast |

| Year / linked scope | Base allowance (USD) | Forecast (USD) |
|---|---|---|
| 2026 · F-01: scoped corrective allowance | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| 2027 · F-02: cooling-pump renewal | 48,000 | 49,440 |
| 2028 · No renewal in this extract | 0 | 0 |
| 2029 · F-03: sealant renewal | 25,000 | 27,318 |
| 2030 · No renewal in this extract | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 85,000 | 88,758 |

## Basis, definitions and limits

Fictional planning allowances, not contractor quotations or local market prices. Actual scope, quantities, access, fees, contingency and taxes require project-specific review.

Forecast = base allowance x 1.03^(year - 2026), rounded to whole USD. The 3% rate is a demonstration assumption, not a market forecast.

F-01 is an investigation/correction allowance, not a generator replacement estimate. F-04 has no capital allowance. No lifecycle duplicates are added. Zero means no item in this extract, not no future need.

**ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE | FICTIONAL DATA**

# Maintenance and CMMS readiness scorecard

Can we trust the maintenance information behind the dashboard?

Each measure retains a numerator, denominator and next action. Targets are illustrative; these are not Keystone client results.

| 100 | 40 | 20 |
|---|---|---|
| PM tasks due | Critical assets sampled | Closure records reviewed |

| Measure / calculation | Observed / sample target | Action |
|---|---|---|
| On-time PM · 90 ÷ 100 | 90% / 95% | Review 10 late or incomplete tasks and evidence. |
| Critical-asset completeness · 36 ÷ 40 | 90% / 100% | Complete four records and verify required fields. |
| Work captured · 180 ÷ 200 requests | 90% / 95% | Reconcile 20 requests outside the CMMS. |
| Closure quality · 17 ÷ 20 records | 85% / 90% | Coach required evidence; resample after correction. |

## Basis, definitions and limits

Fictional reporting period: August 2026. Measures come from the stated sample denominators and are not industry benchmarks. Missing denominators should display "No data," not zero performance.

The equipment workflow links a stable asset ID with make/model/serial, location, condition, technical attributes, document references and PM tasks. Import mapping requires confirmation with the client's software provider.

For this demonstration, condition uses 5 = excellent and 1 = critical throughout. Source systems using another scale require explicit mapping before consolidation.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE | FICTIONAL DATA

# Owner-side bid comparison

Which proposal is comparable, and what must be resolved before award?

A fictional mechanical-room renewal illustrates why the lowest submitted price is only the start of a procurement decision.

| 3 | USD 9,000 | Pending |
|---|---|---|
| Illustrative proposals | Known addition to Bid A | Award decision |

| Bidder / base (USD) | Known scope adjustment | Decision status |
|---|---|---|
| Contractor A · 48,000 | 9,000 shutdown support excluded; known total 57,000. | Controls scope and warranty unresolved. |
| Contractor B · 55,000 | Shutdown support included; known total 55,000. | Confirm quantities, dates and fixed-price scope. |
| Contractor C · 52,000 | Shutdown support excluded; price not provided. | Total not comparable until clarification. |

## Basis, definitions and limits

Fictional bidders and prices; all amounts exclude tax. "Known total" does not imply complete scope normalization. No supplier endorsement is intended.

Decision: obtain written scope reconciliation before award. Bid B is lowest on known totals, but outstanding scope and commercial items must still be closed.

Source trail: approved scope S-01 > clarification RFI-01 > written bid revision > award decision. Closeout then records deficiency owner, due date, correction evidence and independent client verification.